

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated December 2, 1998, claims 6, 8, and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-14 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, the Applicant was reminded to maintain a clear line of demarcation between the present application and the recited co-pending applications.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for her helpful comments and has amended the specification to update the status of the co-pending applications.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (5) of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu. In paragraph (6) of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Terry. In paragraph (7) of the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu in view of Dworkin.

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the amendments above and the arguments below.

A. The Ryu Reference

The Ryu reference teaches a distributed database system where terminals are connected in a network. Each terminal unit stores respectively the real data and a temporary center for storing control information. See Abstract.

B. The Terry Reference

The Terry reference describes continuous queries to append-only databases. Where data is continuously added to a database, users can issue permanent queries and be notified whenever data matches the query. See Abstract.

C. The Dworkin Reference

The Dworkin reference describes an automated system that assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services sold by a plurality of vendors. The system includes a programmed computer which is linked to a database. The database contains information about a large number of different products and/or services, arranged in various categories. For each product or service, the database contains information on price, vendor, specifications, and/or availability. See Abstract.

D. Claims 1-14 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 are generally directed to an invention that provides a resource management system. The system comprises a plurality of servers, grouped into local servers and regional servers. The local servers comprise means for storing resources, and the regional servers comprise means for storing profiles of resources. The local and regional servers are linked together for electronically transferring profiles and resources therebetween. A PC is coupled to one or more of the servers, where the PC stores profiles of resources into one or more of the regional servers, searches all of the profiles in all of the regional servers, and accesses a resource from any of the local servers based on the searched profiles.

The cited references do not teach or suggest elements of the claimed invention. Namely, the cited references do not teach or suggest the PC storing PROFILEs of RESOURCEs into one or more of the REGIONAL SERVERs, nor do the cited references teach or suggest the element of

linking the LOCAL and REGIONAL SERVERs together so that PROFILEs and RESOURCEs can be transferred therebetween.

In contrast, the Ryu reference merely teaches that contents are transferred from a data offering terminal unit to a contents control center, see FIG. 2A, and that the data offering terminal unit stores the content information in the contents control center. Even if the analogy of Page 2 of the Office Action were correct, the data offering terminal unit (analogized to the LOCAL SERVER of the present invention) would be placing the contents information (analogized to the PROFILE of the present invention) into the contents control center (analogized to the REGIONAL SERVER of the present invention), not the user terminal unit (analogized to the PC of the present invention).

The present invention employs the PC to store the PROFILE in the REGIONAL SERVER, not the LOCAL SERVER as described in Ryu. Thus, Ryu teaches away from the present invention, because it uses the LOCAL SERVER to store the PROFILE in the REGIONAL SERVER, not the PC as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Further, Ryu teaches that only content information (analogized to PROFILEs) are transferred between the data offering terminal unit (LOCAL SERVER) and the contents control center (REGIONAL SERVER). The claims of the present invention link the LOCAL SERVERs and REGIONAL SERVERs together so that PROFILEs and RESOURCEs can be transferred therebetween. There is no teaching in Ryu to transfer the detail information (RESOURCEs) from the data offering terminal unit (LOCAL SERVER) to the contents control center (REGIONAL SERVER).

The ancillary Terry reference does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of the Ryu reference, namely, Terry does not teach or suggest the PC storing PROFILEs of RESOURCEs into one or more of the REGIONAL SERVERs, nor do the cited references teach or suggest the element of

linking the LOCAL and REGIONAL SERVERs together so that PROFILEs and RESOURCEs can be transferred therebetween. Terry merely deals with continuous queries of a database.

The other ancillary reference, Dworkin, also does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of the Ryu reference, namely Dworkin does not teach or suggest the PC storing PROFILEs of RESOURCEs into one or more of the REGIONAL SERVERs, nor do the cited references teach or suggest the element of linking the LOCAL and REGIONAL SERVERs together so that PROFILEs and RESOURCEs can be transferred therebetween. Dworkin merely teaches a way to price shop via database query.

The novel limitations of the present invention allow for a client-server system that is more interchangeable and useful than those described in the prior art. The allowability of a REGIONAL SERVER to transfer RESOURCEs to a LOCAL SERVER allows for geographical areas to be better served depending on the PC interaction in certain regions of the country, as well as allowing for easier reconfiguration of the system of the present invention. Further, using the PC to store PROFILE information allows for each user to store additional information to the database.

The various elements of the Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in Ryu, Terry, and Dworkin. In addition, the Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by Ryu, Terry, and Dworkin.

Thus, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 are allowable over Ryu, Terry, and Dworkin. Further, dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-14 are submitted to be allowable over Ryu, Terry, and Dworkin in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 6, and 9, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-14 recite additional novel elements not shown by Ryu, Terry, and Dworkin.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


David M. Siefert

By his attorneys,

GATES & COOPER

6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 642-4140

Date: FEBRUARY 19 1999

By: 
Name: Anthony J. Orler
Reg. No.: 41,232

AJO/amb